1: Handy E-5 (1920-1921)1923 OX6 Marquesas OX6

Personal Names

Names of individual men and women, that is to say, personal names, were the property of families. It is said that in ancient times one could recognize the family to which an individual belonged by his name. This was certainly true of those who knew genealogy; and there seems to have been in the Marquesas no secrecy with regard to genealogies and personal names such as there was in Tahiti and Hawaii.

Names have no gender, a child's name being decided upon before its birth and given to it regardless of its sex. There was one limitation, however, in connection with this: the same name might be given to two sisters or two brothers, but the same name could not be given to a brother and a sister. The reason for this is obscure. It was in connection with the naming of the first-born, that the greatest care was taken. In the first place all the immediate relatives must agree upon the names that were selected. Names were given to the child by its father, its mother, its grandfathers, its grandmothers, by the father's brothers, and the mother's sisters. It was explained that the object of naming on the part of all these relatives of the child was in order that he should represent every ascending and descending branch of the family. When a child was adopted it was these same relatives who gave the child its adoptive names.

An informant on Nuku Hiva said that one of the names given to every child meant "the head of his mother's brother." For example, there is living in Nuku Hiva now a woman named Te-u'u-o-Taioa, which the informant said was to be translated "the head of Taioa," the woman's maternal uncle being named Taioa. This evidence is particularly interesting in connection with the sanctity of the head, the intimate association of personality and *mana* with the head, and the frequent placing of the child on the heads of *pahupahu* (maternal uncles and paternal aunts) in the rites performed during childhood. Naming the child the head of a *pahupahu* would seem to be for the purpose of sealing the most irrefragable bond.

As was said above, names were given to adopted children by exactly the same family representatives as those who named a child actually born in a family. The names given by the adopting family do not, however, seem to have been considered as clearly the personal property as do the names belonging to the family in which one was born. This is proved by the fact that one could give one's child a name from the genealogy of one's adoptive family only with the permission of the members of that family. In adoption a child might be named and adopted either by the father or by the mother or by both. If it were only the mother who gave it a name, a child had no rights from or relationship to the father.

1: Handy E-5 (1920-1921)1923 OX6 Marquesas OX6

this association. Thus all of the possessions of chiefs or priests were *tapu*. Likewise all the paraphernalia associated with the sacred place and with worship was *tapu*. (The *tapu* of sacred places is described under Sacred Places of Sepulture and under Sacred Precincts.)

Sacredness of Things

Colors were *tapu* in certain bays and on certain islands, apparently as a result of some priest having declared them sacred to his spirit before his death. (See 14, p. 53). All objects of that color were then *tapu*. The games of stilt-walking and javelin throwing, and the blowing of the conch shell, were forbidden to women.

The offering of first-fruits grew out of a *tapu* of sacredness. The removal of a *tapu* from a catch of fish which released the catch, making it free to be eaten by the people, was accomplished by offering a part of the catch to the gods—this offering of first fruits removed the *tapu* on the catch. Before eating a meal, natives always offered a little food to their ancestral spirits. In the story of Kae there is an account of hunting doves (*kuku*) in the mountains. The first dove killed by the men and women who were hunting was not eaten but was set aside, being *tapu*.

MAKING TAPU

It was in the power of the priest at the tribal temple to restrict, by making sacred, men, animals, houses, land, or any other thing. For example, if a man had a knife that he desired to be made sacred, he could take it to the priest at the temple who would consecrate it for him (19). Whether this was done by means of a ceremony or otherwise is unknown to me, but it seems probable that it was merely a matter of putting the object to be consecrated in contact with some sacred object, such as an image. Anything that had been cut with a knife, that had been made sacred in this way was *tapu*.

Similar to this manner of restricting persons or things by means of consecrating them was the practice of establishing ownership by giving a thing a sacred name. A man could *tapu* anything to himself either by calling it his head or by giving it a sacred name, that was his personal property. Closely related to this was the custom already mentioned by which inspirational priests sometimes declared certain things *tapu* at the time they died. One priest on the occasion of his detah on Uu Pou declared that long hair should be thereafter forbidden for the women of his tribe. Another priest on Nuku Hiva at his death declared that everything red, whether dress or food, was sacred to that priest's spirit and could not be worn or eaten by the common people.